UNITED	STATES DISTRIC	CT COURT	7
Eastern	District of	Michigan	1-
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA			
NG A Have	ORDER	OF DETENTION PENDING	TRIAL
Defendant	Case Number	: 13-20297	
In accordance with the Bail Reform Act. 18 U.S.C.	. § 3142(f) a detention hearing bas (seen hald. I conclude that the following for	ata saanina tha
detention of the defendant pending trial in this case.	3 or 12(1), a determine meaning mas	ocen neid. I conclude that the following fa	cis require me
(1) The defendant is charged with	Part I—Findings of Fact		
(1) The defendant is charged with an offense desc or local offense that would have been a federa	i Olicuse il a circumstance giving ci	has been convicted of a federal offe	nsc – 🔲 state-
a state of violetice as defined in 18 U.S.(0.3156(a)(4)	to rederal jurisdiction had existed - ura	It 15
an offense for which the maximum senten an offense for which a maximum term of i	ce is life imprisonment or death.		
 			
a felony that was committed after the defer § 3142(f)(1)(A)-(C), or comparable state of	ndant had been convicted of two or	more prior federal offenses described in 13	8 U.S.C.
(2) the offense described in finding (1) was comm	litted while the defendant was on re	lease pending trial for a federal state or lo	cal offense
(a) 11 barrow of mot more man live years has elanse	ad since the date of conviction	release of the defendant from impri	sonment
for the offense described in finding (1). (4) Findings Nos. (1), (2) and (3) establish a rebutt safety of (an) other person(s) and the communication of the			
safety of (an) other person(s) and the communi	ty. I further find that the defendant	has not rebutted this presumption.	bly assure the
	Alternative Findings (A)	• •	
(1) There is probable cause to believe that the defe	ndant has committed an offense		
☐ under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c).			•
(2) The defendant has not rebutted the presumption the appearance of the defendant or required and	established by finding 1 that no con	dition or combination of conditions will re	asonably assure
the appearance of the defendant as required and	i the safety of the community.		
(1) There is a serious risk that the defendant will no	Alternative Findings (B)		
(2) There is a serious risk that the defendant will en	idanger the safety of another person	or the community.	
		 	
			
Part II—Wr	itten Statement of Reasons fo	r Detention	
I find that the credible testimony and information sub	mitted at the hearing establishes by	Detertion Clear and convincing evidence	□ a prepon-
derance of the evidence that		At cross and convenions oversome	_ w brobon
	······································		
			
Part II	I—Directions Regarding Dete	ention	
I he detendant is committed to the custody of the Attorn	ney General or his designated repres	entative for confinement in a corrections for	acility separate,
to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or servin reasonable opportunity for private consultation with defe	le sentences or being held in custo	ndy nending appeal. The defendant chal	l ha afforded a
or with the possent in charge of the corrections facility	y shall deliver the defendant to the	of the United States or on request of an a United States marshal for the purpose of	an appearance
in confined on what a court proceeding.	1/1/4/2011	1,000	·· - ··I·It
8 14 2013 Date	_ monu !	Mysoll	,
Daw		ignature of Judge	
		ate Judge Mona K. Majzoub e and Title of Judge	

^{*}Insert as applicable: (a) Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. § 801 et seq.); (b) Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. § 951 et seq.); or (c) Section 1 of Act of Sept. 15, 1980 (21 U.S.C. § 955a).

Alfred Eugene Horn Order of Detention

Defendant's term of supervised release commenced in this Court on 3/28/12. As a mandatory condition of that supervised release he was "not to commit another federal, state of local crime".

On May 17, 2013 Defendant was allegedly involved in new criminal activity with a firearm. Specifically, and according to the police reports, at 2:04 a.m. he was at the Studio 51 Nightclub on 1995 Woodbridge Street in Detroit when he got into a fight with another patron. It appears that alcohol may have been an issue. He went to his car which was parked just outside the club and returned to the club with a semi-automatic handgun. It is reported that Defendant fired the handgun several times, striking three people with his bullets. Defendant was restrained by the club security staff until the police arrived. He was arrested and subsequently charged with three counts of Assault With Intent to Murder. He has remained in the Wayne County Jail on a \$500,00 cash/surety bond since his initial arrest.

After Defendant was taken into custody, an arrest warrant was issued in this court for violation of his supervised release. At the state court Preliminary Examination hearing, a witness failed to appear and the charges were dismissed. The charges were re-issued on June 20, 2013 according to the Wayne County Prosecutor assigned to the case. However, the warrant is not currently in the lien system.

Defendant seeks a bond arguing that the facts are complicated and that Defendant did not shoot one of the victims. The Government seeks detention based upon the Defendant's danger to the community. A hearing is scheduled to proceed on the violation matter before Judge Steeh on August 20, 2013.

Notwithstanding the confusion over the issue of whether the case has been reinstated in the state court system, and why the warrant is not in the lien system at this time, the fact remains that Defendant was under the supervision of this Court when he was arrested and charged with a crime of violence, Assault with Intent to Murder, involving the use of a semi-automatic handgun, and possibly alcohol, in the shooting of three adults at a night club in the city of Detroit. This is tantamount to violent and dangerous behavior which puts the community at risk.

The police report and this record present clear and convincing evidence that Defendant is a danger to the community and that there is no condition or combination of conditions that would assure the safety of the community. Therefore Detention is Ordered.